Patent Application Number: 10/042,987

REMARKS

Claims 7-16 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-6 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein.

A. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

Claims 7 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, is directed to the specification, not the claims. More specifically, 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, requires that the specification provide proper enablement for the claimed invention. The proper handling of such a situation is to object to the specification under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Although the Examiner has presented an inaccurate rejection, the Applicants will address the Examiner's apparent concerns regarding the originally filed specification's enablement of the presently pending claims to expedite the prosecution of the present application.

The Examiner alleges that the originally filed specification fails to enable one of ordinary skilled in the art to make and/or use rasterized and non-rasterized documents. This position is respectfully traversed.

The originally filed specification clearly teaches, at page 3, lines 3-6, the rasterization of a document. More specifically, the originally filed specification, at page 3, lines 3-6, states: "The server retrieves and converts the requested documents to a raster image that is then compressed according to attributes based on information received from the client device in the initial document request."

Moreover, the originally filed specification clearly teaches, at page 5, lines 3-7, the rasterization of a document. More specifically, the originally filed specification, at page 5, lines 3-7, states: "The server retrieves and converts the requested documents, if they have not been previously converted, to a raster image that is then compressed according to attributes based on information received from the client device in the initial document request."

-5-

Patent Application Number: 10/042,987

Lastly, the originally filed specification clearly teaches, in the Abstract, the rasterization of a document. More specifically, the originally filed specification, in the Abstract, states: "The server retrieves and converts <u>the requested documents to a raster image</u> that is then compressed according to attributes based on information received from the client device in the initial document request."

As clearly demonstrated above, the originally filed specification clearly provides support for the rasterization of a document. Also, the originally filed specification clearly provides support for non-rasterized documents as a non-rasterized document is a document that has not been rasterized.

It is further submitted that rasterization is the act of converting a document from a page definition language (e.g., PostScript) to an arrangement of pixels on the page or screen; i.e., rasterizing is the interpretation of an image from a set of digital codes into an actual visual representation. This technique or process that is well-known to those skilled in the art of reproducing documents into a visual form.

For example, US Patent Numbers 5,796,411; 5,768,489; 5,533,172; and 5,412,483 are just various examples of the hundreds of US Patents that teach rasterization.

It is not required by 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, that the specification teach to the skilled artisan what is already readily known in the art, but to provide enough information to enable one of skill in the art to make and/or use the presently claimed invention.

As demonstrated above, the originally filed specification clearly provides support for the rasterization of a document. Moreover, those skill in the art of reproducing documents into a visual form are readily knowledgeable to understand how to make and/or use a rasterized document, as set forth in the presently pending claims.

B. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Dekel et al.

Claims 7-10 and 12-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by <u>Dekel et al.</u> (US-A-6,314,452). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over <u>Dekel et al.</u> is respectfully traversed.

-6-

Initially, the Examiner has maintained this rejection by holding that since the claim limitations directed to rasterization is allegedly not supported in the originally filed specification, the Examiner can rightfully ignore this explicit limitation. This position by the Examiner is improper. The Examiner must give weight to each and every claimed limitation.

By the Examiner's own admission, the present rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) can only stand if the Examiner ignores the claim limitations directed to rasterization. Since the Examiner has improperly ignored expressed limitations in a claim, the present rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is invalid and moot. Therefore, by the Examiner's own admission, Dekel et al. fails to anticipate claims 7-10 and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

However, to expedite the prosecution, the Applicants will reiterate the shortcomings of the teachings of Dekel et al.

In formulating the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), the Examiner alleges that Dekel et al. teaches a client-side device that requests a section of a document from a server-side device and the server-side device receives the request. The Examiner further alleges that Dekel et al. teaches that the server-side device retrieves the requested document; identifies, in the retrieved document, the requested section; and converts the identified section into a wavelet compressed image. Lastly, the Examiner alleges that Dekel et al. teaches the server-side device communicates the wavelet compressed image to the client-side device, which decompresses the received wavelet compressed image and displays the decompressed document section. From these allegations, the Examiner concludes that the presently claimed invention is anticipated by Dekel et al. These positions and conclusion by the Examiner are respectfully traversed.

The present invention, as set forth in independent claim 7, is directed to a method for viewing, on a client-side device, documents requested from a server-side device, the client-side device and server-side device having a communication link therebetween. The claimed method generates a request from a client-side device to be sent to a server-side device, the request identifying a non-rasterized document, a section of the non-rasterized document to be sent to the client-side device, and a

-7-

compression format corresponding to the client-side device. As set forth in independent claim 7, the server-side device retrieves, in response to receiving the request from the client-side device, the requested non-rasterized document and identifies the requested section of the requested non-rasterized document; rasterizes the identified section of the requested non-rasterized document; compresses the rasterized section of the requested non-rasterized document into a compressed image having the identified compression format corresponding to the client-side device; and communicates the compressed image to the client-side device. The client-side device decompresses the received compressed image and displays the decompressed image.

As clearly set forth above, the presently claimed invention, as set forth in independent claim 7, recites that the server-side device rasterizes the identified section of the requested non-rasterized document before compressing the (rasterized) section of the requested non-rasterized document into a compressed image having the identified compression format corresponding to the client-side device.

In contrast, <u>Dekel et al.</u> clearly teaches that the identified section of the requested document is compressed, without any rasterization, into a wavelet compressed image. Thus, <u>Dekel et al.</u> fails to teach that the server-side device rasterizes the identified section of the requested non-rasterized document before compressing the (rasterized) section of the requested non-rasterized document into a compressed image having the identified compression format corresponding to the client-side device, as set forth in independent claim 7.

With respect to independent claim 12, the present invention is directed to a method for viewing, on a client-side device, documents requested from a server-side device, the client-side device and server-side device having a communication link therebetween. The claimed method generates a request from a client-side device to be sent to a server-side device, the request identifying a non-rasterized document and a compression format corresponding to the client-side device. As set forth in independent claim 12, the server-side device retrieves, in response to receiving the request from the client-side device, the requested non-rasterized document; rasterizes the requested non-rasterized document; compresses the rasterized document into a compressed image having the identified compression format corresponding to the client-side device;

and communicates the compressed image to the client-side device. The client-side device decompresses the received compressed image and displays the decompressed image.

As clearly set forth above, the presently claimed invention, as set forth in independent claim 12, recites that the server-side device rasterizes the requested non-rasterized document before compressing the (rasterized) requested document into a compressed image having the identified compression format corresponding to the client-side device.

In contrast, <u>Dekel et al</u>. clearly teaches that the requested document is compressed, without any rasterization, into a wavelet compressed image. Thus, <u>Dekel et al</u>. fails to teach that the server-side device rasterizes the requested non-rasterized document before compressing the (rasterized) requested document into a compressed image having the identified compression format corresponding to the client-side device, as set forth in independent claim 12.

With respect to dependent claims 8-10 and 13-15, the Applicant, for the sake of brevity, will not address the reasons supporting patentability for these individual dependent claims, as these claims depends directly or indirectly from allowable independent claims 7 and 12. The Applicant reserves the right to address the patentability of these dependent claims at a later time, should it be necessary.

Accordingly, in view of the remarks set forth above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

C. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Dekel et aL

Claims 11 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over <u>Dekel et al</u>. (US-A-6,314,452). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 over <u>Dekel et al</u>. is respectfully traversed.

With respect to dependent claims 11 and 16, the Applicants, for the sake of brevity, will not address the reasons supporting patentability for these dependent claims, as these claims depend directly from allowable independent claims 7 and 12. The Applicants reserve the right to address the patentability of these dependent claims at a later time, should it be necessary.

-9-

Patent Application Number: 10/042,987

Accordingly, in view of the remarks set forth above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of all the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the present rejections. Also, an early indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Nickerson
Registration No. 33,265
Basch & Nickerson LLP
1777 Penfield Road
Penfield, New York 14526
Telephone: (585) 899-3970

MJN/mjn

-10-